

Application No.: 09/577,932
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated August 5, 2004
Response to the Office Action of May 5, 2004

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1 – 5 and 13 – 15 are pending in this application. Claims 1 – 5, 14 and 15 stand rejected. Claim 13 has been allowed. No new matter has been added. The rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully traversed below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 – 5, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Specifically, on page 3, lines 1 – 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the language “ordinary usage” is not defined by the specification, and therefore would not apprise one of ordinary skill of the art of the scope of the claims.

Claims 1, 14 and 15 have been amended to delete the recitation “wherein the metal posts would not melt in their *ordinary usage*” and claim 4 has been amended to delete the recitation “wherein the plurality of electrode pads would not melt in their *ordinary usage*” to obviate the §112, second paragraph, rejection.

In view of the above amendments, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1, 4, 14 and 15 recite the invention in accordance with the requirements of §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under §112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Furthermore, although no rejection in view of prior art has been issued in the current Office Action, applicants respectfully submit that the currently amended claims patentably distinguish over the previously cited prior art (**Beddingfield and Matsuda et al.**)

Application No.: 09/577,932
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated August 5, 2004
Response to the Office Action of May 5, 2004

notwithstanding the removal of the language "wherein the.... would not melt in their ordinary usage" from independent claims 1, 4, 14 and 15. For example, each of claims 1, 14 and 15 recite the feature "wherein the plurality of metal posts have a flat top surface." Claim 4 recites "wherein the plurality of electrode pads have a flat top surface." These features recited in claims 1, 4, 14 and 15 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art. More particularly, the I/O bumps disclosed by the previously cited **Beddingfield** and **Matsuda et al.** references, which the Examiner has asserted correspond to the claimed metal posts and electrode pads, are spherical and do not have a flat top surface.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth in detail above, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. An indication of allowability of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

Application No.: 09/577,932
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated August 5, 2004
Response to the Office Action of May 5, 2004

In the event that any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge
any fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully Submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



William M. Schertler
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 35,348

WMS:kal
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 822-1100
Q:\2000\000663\Filings\1.111 Amendment - August 2004.doc